

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are pending in this application, of which claims 1-2, 4-5, 8, 11-12, 15 and 19-20 have been amended. No new claims have been added.

The drawings, Abstract and specification have been amended to correct various grammatical, idiomatic and spelling errors. FIGS. 10, 12, 14 and 15 have been corrected to correct the spelling of the word "brake." No new matter has been added.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16-19, 21 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,140,784 to Mazda (hereinafter "**Mazda**").

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Mazda discloses a method and circuit for controlling a voice coil motor (VCM) for a disk drive actuator assembly such that the actuator assembly moves to a landing area at a constant velocity when the disk drive loses power. The circuit includes a sense amplifier for sensing and amplifying current to the VCM, a current integrator for determining the actual velocity of the actuator assembly during every seek, an H-bridge driver, which controls the direction of current to the VCM and magnitude of voltage across the VCM and a window compare and logic block that receives and sorts information from the integrator, and a timer. The window compare and logic block determines the direction of current and magnitude of voltage to apply to the VCM. During a loss of power, e.g. a power down or sudden loss of power, the actuator assembly is controlled through a sequence of movements, depending on the position and actual velocity of the actuator assembly/transducer head at the moment power was lost, to ensure that the transducer head is

retracted to the landing area at a constant velocity.

Fig. 2 shows step 160 (“Apply constant voltage to VCM To Move Actuator/Head To Disk ID At Constant Velocity”); and step 170 “Reverse Direction of Current to VCM and Apply Constant Voltage To Move Actuator/Head To Disk OD and To Landing Area At Constant Velocity”, where ID is the inner diameter track of the disk and OD is the outer diameter track of the disk.

Mazda discloses that step 160 ends with the actuator/head at the inner diameter track, but fails to disclose such movement ends at a predetermined position contacting a stopper, as disclosed on page 19, line 8 of the specification of the instant application.

Accordingly, claims 1, 8 and 16 have been amended to recite this distinction.

Thus, the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 2 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over **Mazda**.

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Column 4, lines 16-17 disclose that the ID velocity and the OD velocity may or may not be the same.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. **Mazda** fails to disclose any relation between the respective voltages producing the ID and OD velocities and therefore fails to teach, mention or suggest that the respective voltages are different, as recited in claims 2 and 9 of the instant application.

Thus, the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 5, 12 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over **Mazda** in view of U.S. Patent 6,169,382 to McKenzie et al. (hereinafter “**McKenzie et al.**”).

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

McKenzie et al. has been cited for teaching shorting of the coil to cause braking of the actuator but, like Mazda, fails to teach, mention or suggest the contact with the stopper, as recited in the proposed amendments to claims 1, 8 and 16, from which claims 5, 12 and 20 respectively depend.

Thus, the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Mazda in view of U.S. Patent 6,850,382 to Fayeulle et al. (hereinafter "Fayeulle et al.").

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The Examiner has urged that the use of the stoppers to limit the movement toward the inside diameter is well known in the art as taught by Fayeulle et al.

This may be true, but the use of a stopper is not obvious because the effect of physical impairment of the motion of the actuator on the control of the actuator by the motor is not taken into account in Mazda. In contrast, the present invention utilizes the stopper as part of the control of the motion of the actuator.

Thus, the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection should be withdrawn.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, claims 1-22, as amended, are in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. **10/694,742**
Response to Office Action dated March 18, 2005

indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS,
HANSON & BROOKS, LLP

William L. Brooks

William L. Brooks

Attorney for Applicant

Reg. No. 34,129

WLB/ak

Atty. Docket No. **031254**

Suite 1000

1725 K Street, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20006

(202) 659-2930



23850

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Enclosures:

Replacement Sheets of Drawing (Figs. 10-16)

Substitute Abstract of the Disclosure

Q:\HOME\AKERR\WLB\03\031254\06-16-05 Amendment

IN THE DRAWINGS:

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Fig. 10, 12, 14 and 15. These sheets, which include Figs. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16, replace the original sheets.